31st January 1934]

Employment of and grant of lands on darkhast to ex-army men.

* 566 *Q.*—Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any representation was made to the Government regarding the non-enforcement of G.Os. No. 415, dated 26th March 1930, No. 590, dated 25th May 1931, No. 1544, dated 2nd December 1932, and No. 288, dated 3rd April 1933, regarding the grant of land on darkhast and the giving of appointments to the ex-army men and their sons and by whom; and

(*b*) what action the Government have taken to see that the Government Orders referred to above are strictly carried out?

A.—(*a*) A representation on the subject was received from the hon. Member himself and has been investigated. The hon. Member is referred to letter No. 27438-4, Public (Military), dated 27th January 1934. Other representations have from time to time been received from ex-army men.

(*b*) The Government have no reason to believe that their instructions are not being generally carried out, particularly since the issue of G.O. No. 288, Public (Military), dated 3rd April 1933. The issue of further instructions to ensure preference being given to men discharged from the Madras Pioneers and other recently disbanded regiments is under consideration. Individual cases will be investigated, if brought to notice.

Local Self-Government

Appointment of executive officers to municipalities.

* 567 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) the total number of municipalities in Andhra districts to which executive officers have been appointed and those to which executive officers have not been appointed;

(*b*) the total number of municipalities in Tamil and other parts to which executive officers have been appointed and those to which executive officers have not been appointed;

(*c*) the number and names of municipalities in the Presidency to which the Government contemplate appointing executive officers in the near future and the reasons therefor; and

(*d*) whether it is a fact that the Government contemplate appointing executive officers to the municipalities of Mangalore and Calicut; and if so, the reasons therefor?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the appended statement [a], from which it may be seen to which of the municipalities in the Andhra and Tamil districts Commissioners have been appointed.

---

*[a] Printed as Appendix II on page 303 infra.

[31st January 1934

(c) & (d) Government have under consideration the question of notifying some more municipalities for the appointment of a Commissioner, in the interests of their administration but it is not possible to say definitely at this stage whether the municipalities mentioned will be included.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"May I know what the criterion is for appointing executive officers to municipalities? And whether in all cases the Government feel that they are in the interests of the administration?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"In all cases where, in the interests of the administration, the Government feel that the appointments are necessary, the appointments are made."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"What is the nature of the interests of the administration? Is it misadministration or maladministration?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"The interests of the administration mean the interests of the tax-payers."

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—"May I know how it is that in certain districts having bigger municipalities, commissioners are not appointed, as in the case of Anantapur? I mean in the case of Nandyal an officer is appointed, while in Guntur no appointment has been made. The matter has been in correspondence for so many years with the Government."

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I do not know what the correspondence is to which the hon. Member refers. The appointments are not made with regard to the size. Whenever the Government feel that, in the interests of the administration it is necessary, it will be done."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"Is Mangalore one of the municipalities for which an officer is contemplated?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I cannot say in the case of municipalities where appointments have not been made whether they will or will not be notified for the purpose."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"With reference to answers to (c) and (d), I just want to know whether Mangalore is one of those municipalities."

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"It is not possible for me to say. Sir, till the Government passes orders; we treat the matter as confidential."

Mr. P. PEDDI RAJU:—"May I know, Sir, whether a commissioner has been appointed for the Palacole Municipality?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"No commissioner has been actually appointed, Sir. There has been a special officer now. When the elections are carried out, the municipality will be reconstituted."

31st January 1934]

Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu :—" Is there not a proposal, Sir, to appoint an executive officer for Guntur? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" Government are considering various names; but till orders are actually passed, they are treated as confidential."

Mr. V. T. Arasu :—" May I know, Sir, whether it is a fact that in the case of certain municipalities, commissioners are appointed in spite of resolutions passed by the majority of the councillors concerned? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" Yes, Sir."

Mr. V. T. Arasu :—" May I know, Sir, from the hon. the Minister whether he will furnish a list of such municipalities? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" I cannot off-hand give this information, Sir."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar :—" May I know, Sir, whether it is not a fact that it is the interests of the administrations which govern the conditions to the appointment of commissioners? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" I have stated that more than once."

Mr. V. T. Arasu :—" May I know, Sir, the reasons which weighed with the Government in throwing out the resolutions passed by the municipal councillors protesting against the appointment of commissioners? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" These appointments are made in pursuance of legislation passed by this House and, whenever Government feel that such appointments are in the interests of the municipality, they are making them."

Appointment of panchayat officers.

* 568 *Q.*—Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have appointed panchayat officers for all districts;

(*b*) if not, what the reason is for the delay in making the appointments; and

(*c*) what the reasons of the Government are for not placing these appointments in the hands of the Public Services Commission?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) Government have since appointed district panchayat officers for all districts, except Nellore, the Nilgiris and Tinnevelly. Appointments for these districts are under consideration and will shortly be made.

(*c*) Under section 8 of the Madras Services Commission Act, 1929 (Madras Act XI of 1929), the Commission shall advise the Local Government in regard to recruitment to any provincial or subordinate service. The service of district panchayat officers is not such a service.